arXiv:1605.06387v1 [math.CO] 20 May 2016

CROSS-INTERSECTING PAIRS OF HYPERGRAPHS

RON AHARONI AND DAVID HOWARD

Abstract. Two hypergraphs $H_1,\ H_2$ are called *cross-intersecting* if $e_1 \cap e_2 \neq \emptyset$ for every pair of edges $e_1 \in H_1,\ e_2 \in H_2$. Each of the hypergraphs is then said to *block* the other. Given parameters n, r, m we determine the maximal size of a sub-hypergraph of $[n]^r$ (meaning that it is r-partite, with all sides of size n) for which there exists a blocking sub-hypergraph of $[n]^r$ of size m. The answer involves a fractal-like (that is, self-similar) sequence, first studied by Knuth. We also study the same question with $\binom{n}{r}$ replacing $[n]^r$.

1. Blockers in r-partite hypergraphs

1.1. **Blockers.** For a set A and a number r let $\binom{A}{r}$ be the set of all subsets of size r of A. Given numbers r and n let $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, and let $[n]^r$ be the complete r-partite hypergraph with all sides being equal to $[n]$. Let U be either $\binom{[n]}{r}$ or $[n]^r$, and let F be a sub-hypergraph of U. The *blocker* $B(F)$ of F is the set of those edges of U that meet all edges of F. For a number t we denote by $b(t)$ the maximal size of $|B(F)|$, where F ranges over all sets of t edges in U. Which of the two meanings of "$b(t)$" we are using will be clear from the context.

1.2. **Background - the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem and rainbow matchings.** A *matching* is a collection of disjoint sets. The largest size of a matching in a hypergraph H is denoted by $\nu(H)$. The famous Erdős-Ko-Rado (EKR) theorem [8] states that if $r \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and a hypergraph $H \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$ has more than $\binom{n-1}{r-1}$ edges, then $\nu(H) > 1$. This has been extended in more than one way to pairs of hypergraphs. For example, in [17, 19] the following was proved:

Theorem 1.1. *If $r \leq \frac{n}{2}$, and $H_1, H_2 \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$ satisfy $|H_1||H_2| > \binom{n-1}{r-1}^2$ (in particular if $|H_i| > \binom{n-1}{r-1},\ i = 1, 2$), then there exist disjoint edges, $e_1 \in H_1,\ e_2 \in H_2$.*

In [17] this was also extended to hypergraphs of different uniformities. In [20, 21] a version of this result was proved for t-intersecting pairs of hypergraphs, for large enough n.

It is natural to try to extend the EKR theorem to more than two hypergraphs. The relevant notion is that of "rainbow matchings".

Definition 1.2. Let $\mathcal{F} = (F_i \mid\ 1 \leq i \leq k)$ be a collection of hypergraphs. A choice of disjoint edges, one from each F_i, is called a *rainbow matching* for $\mathcal{F}$.

Notation 1.3. Given numbers n, r, k satisfying $kr \leq n$, let $f(n, r, k)$ be the smallest number such that $\nu(H) \geq k$ for every $H \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$ larger than $f(n, r, k)$.

Given any numbers n, r, k, let $g(n, r, k)$ be the smallest number such that $\nu(H) \geq k$ for every $H \subseteq [n]^r$ larger than $g(n, r, k)$.

Lemma 1.4. $g(n, r, k) = (k-1)n^{r-1}$.

Proof. To see that $g(n, r, k) \geq (k-1)n^{r-1}$ take F to be the set of edges containing any of given $k-1$ vertices in the same side: $|F| = (k-1)n^{r-1}$ and since the covering number is $k-1$ there is no matching of size k. To show that $g(n, r, k) \leq (k-1)n^{r-1}$, let F be any set of edges of size larger than $(k-1)n^{r-1}$. It is easy to see that $[n]^r$ is the union of n^{r-1} perfect matchings M_i. By the pigeonhole principle $|F \cap M_i| > k-1$ for some i, and since $F \cap M_i$ is a matching, it follows that $\nu(F \cap M_i) \geq k$. □

The research of the first author was supported by BSF grant no. 2006099, by GIF grant no. I −879 − 124.6/2005, by the Technion's research promotion fund, and by the Discont Bank chair.
The research of the second author was supported by BSF grant no. 2006099, and by ISF grants Nos. 779/08, 859/08 and 938/06.

The function $f(n,r,k)$ is hard to determine, see [9, 10] for estimates.

The motivation behind this paper is the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.5.

(1) If $F_1,\dots F_k$ are sub-hypergraphs of $[n]^r$, each of size larger than $(k-1)n^{r-1}$, then there exists a choice of disjoint edges $e_1\in F_1,\dots,e_k\in F_k$.
(2) If $F_1,\dots,F_k$ are sub-hypergraphs of $\binom{[n]}{r}$, all larger than $f(n,r,k)$, then there exists a choice of disjoint edges $e_1\in F_1,\dots,e_k\in F_k$.

In [1] part (1) of this conjecture was proved for $r\leq 3$. The case $k=2$ of part (1) follows from Theorem **??** below, and was proved independently by Alon [2], using a spectral method. Theorem **??** is more general: it determines the maximal size of $|B(H)|$ for a sub-hypergraph H of $[n]^r$, given its size. In particular, it implies that if $|H|>n^{r-1}$ then $|B(H)|<n^{r-1}$, which is the case $k=2$ of part (1).

In the second section we shall turn to the case $U=\binom{[n]}{r}$. Daykin [4] showed how the EKR theorem can be derived from the Kruskal-Katona theorem. His proof also yields the case $r=2$ of Conjecture 1.5. The idea of the proof is that if $|F|$ is large then, by the Kruskal-Katona theorem, the r-shadow of the complements of the sets in F is large, and hence the number of the r-sets that meet all edges in F is small. We extend this idea and find the maximal size of $|B(H)|$ for a sub-hypergraph H of $\binom{[n]}{r}$, given the cardinality of H.

1.3. **A self-similar sequence.** Denote the sides of $[n]^r$ by $V_1,\dots,V_r$ (so, all V_i's are of size n). Choose one vertex v_i from each V_i. Let Ψ_r be the set of (possibly empty) sequences σ of length at most $r-1$ consisting of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s. Let $\Sigma_r=\Psi_r\cup\{\alpha,\omega\}$, where $\alpha=\alpha_r$ and $\omega=\omega_r$ are new elements. Note that $|\Sigma_r|=2^r+1$. We define hypergraphs $F_r(\sigma)$ for all $\sigma\in\Sigma_r$, as follows. Let $F_r(\alpha)=\emptyset$ and $F_r(\omega)=[n]^r$. For a sequence $\sigma\in\Psi_r$ having length $m\geq 0$, and whose j-th term is denoted by σ_j $(j\leq m)$, let:

$$F_r(\sigma)=\{e\in[n]^r\mid v_1\in e\ \sigma_1(v_2\in e\ \sigma_2(v_3\in e\dots\sigma_m(v_{m+1}\in e)\dots)\}$$

For example, $F_r(\emptyset)=\{e\in[n]^r\mid v_1\in e\}$ and $F_r(\wedge,\wedge,\vee)$ is the set of edges $e\in[n]^r$ satisfying:

$$v_1\in e\wedge(v_2\in e\wedge(v_3\in e\vee(v_4\in e)))$$

Let $f_r(\sigma)=|F_r(\sigma)|$.

Lemma 1.6.

If $\sigma\in\Psi_{r-1}$ then

(1) $f_r(\sigma)=nf_{r-1}(\sigma)$
(2) $f_r(\wedge,\sigma)=f_{r-1}(\sigma)$
(3) $f_r(\vee,\sigma)=n^{r-1}+(n-1)f_{r-1}(\sigma)$

Part 1 is true since $F_r(\sigma)=F_{r-1}(\sigma)\times V_r$. Part 2 is true since an edge in $F_r(\wedge,\sigma)$ is obtained from an edge $f\in F_{r-1}(\sigma)$, with indices shifted by 1, by adding v_1. Part 3 is true since $F_r(\vee,\sigma)=\{v_1\}\times V_2\times\ldots\times V_r\cup(V_1\setminus\{v_1\})\times F_{r-1}(\sigma)$ (where, again, edges in $F_{r-1}(\sigma)$ have their indices shifted by 1).

Order $f_r(\sigma)$ by size:

$$0=f_r(\alpha)<f_r(\sigma_1)<f_r(\sigma_2)<\ldots<f_r(\sigma_{2^r})$$

Define $N(i)=N_r(i)$ as $f_r(\sigma_i)$ $(0\leq i\leq 2^r)$.

Example 1.7.

(1) $N(0)=f_r(\alpha)=0$.
(2) $N(1)=f_r(\wedge,\wedge,\dots,\wedge)$ $(r-1$ times), which is 1.
(3) $N(2)=f_r(\wedge,\wedge,\dots,\wedge)$ $(r-2$ times) which is n.
(4) $N(2^{r-1})=f_r(\emptyset)=n^{r-1}$.
(5) $N(2^r)=f_r(\omega)=n^r$.

In accord we order Σ_r as $\sigma(i)$ $(0 \le i \le 2^r)$. For example $\sigma(0) = \alpha,\ \sigma(2^r) = \omega$. We also define the inverse function, which we name "i": if $\sigma(q) = \tau$, then $i(\tau) = q$.

Clearly, for every $\beta, \gamma, \delta \in \Psi_r$ such that $(\beta, \wedge, \gamma)$ and $(\beta, \vee, \delta)$ belong to Ψ_r

$$i((\beta, \wedge, \gamma)) < i(\beta) < i((\beta, \vee, \delta)) \tag{1}$$

The elements of Ψ_r can be viewed as the nodes of a binary tree, the depth of a node being the length of the sequence (so the root, with depth 0, is the empty sequence). The order on Ψ_r, uniquely determined by (1), is known as the "in-order depth first search" on the tree, where $\wedge$ ("left") precedes $\vee$ ("right").

This description of the order on Ψ_r entails an explicit formula for $\sigma(i)$. Represent $i \ne 0, 2^r$ in binary form: $i = 2^{k_0} + 2^{k_1} + \ldots + 2^{k_s}$, where $k_0 > k_1 > \ldots > k_s$. Then $\sigma(i)$ is of length $r - k_s - 1$, and it consists of s symbols of $\vee$ and $r - k_s - 1 - s$ symbols of $\wedge$. It starts with $r - k_0 - 1$ (possibly zero) $\wedge$'s; if $s > 0$ these are followed by a $\vee$; this is followed by $k_0 - k_1 - 1$ (possibly zero) $\wedge$'s, and if $s > 1$ this is followed by a $\vee$, followed by $k_1 - k_2 - 1$ $\wedge$'s, and so forth.

For example, $\sigma_6(13) = \sigma_6(2^3 + 2^2 + 2^0) = (\wedge, \wedge, \vee, \vee, \wedge)$.

The numbers $N(i)$ can also be written explicitly:

$$N(i) = \sum_{i \le s} n^{k_i} (n-1)^i$$

The explicit description of $\sigma(i)$ and the formula for $N(i)$ will not be used below, and hence their proofs are omitted.

Example 1.8. The values of N_3 are:

$0,\ 1,\ n,\ n+(n-1),\ n+n(n-1) = n^2,\ n^2+(n-1),\ n^2+(n-1)n,\ n^2+(n-1)(2n-1),\ n^2+(n-1)n^2 = n^3.$

Lemma 1.9.

(1) For $i \le 2^{r-1}$ we have $N_r(i) = N_{r-1}(i)$, namely the sequence $N_{r-1}(i)$ is an initial segment of $N_r(i)$.
(2) $\sigma(2^p) = (\wedge, \wedge, \ldots, \wedge)$, a sequence of $r - p - 1$ $\wedge$'s, and $N(2^p) = n^p$.
(3) For $i < 2^p$ the sequences $\sigma(i)$ are of the form $(\sigma(2^p), \wedge, \beta)$ (β being some sequence), and for $2^p < i < 2^{p+1}$ the sequences $\sigma(i)$ are of the form $(\sigma(2^p), \vee, \beta)$.
(4) For $p \le r - 1$ and $i \le 2^p$, we have

$$N(2^p + i) = N(2^p) + (n-1)N(i) = n^p + (n-1)N(i)$$

Part 1 is true by part 2 of Lemma 1.6, since $\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(2^{r-1} - 1)$ all start with a $\wedge$. Parts 2 and 3 follow from Equation (1) and the remark following it. Part 4 follows from part 3 of Lemma 1.6.

Part 4 says that the numbers $N(i)$ have a fractal-like pattern, where each sequence N_r is obtained from N_{r-1} by adding on its right an $n-1$-times magnified image of itself, the first element of the right sequence being identified with the last element of the left copy, both being equal to n^{r-1}. This entails:

Lemma 1.10. *If $b, c \le 2^p$ then $N(2^{p+1} + b) - N(2^p + c) = (n-1)(N(2^p + b) - N(c))$.*

1.4. **Shifting.** *Shifting* is an operation on a hypergraph H, defined with respect to a specific linear ordering "$<$" on its vertices. For $x < y$ in $V(H)$ define $s_{xy}(e) = e \cup x \setminus \{y\}$ if $x \notin e$ and $y \in e$, provided $e \cup x \setminus \{y\} \notin H$; otherwise let $s_{xy}(e) = e$. We also write $s_{xy}(H) = \{s_{xy}(e) \mid e \in H\}$. If $s_{xy}(H) = H$ for every pair $x < y$ then H is said to be *shifted*.

Given an r-partite hypergraph G with sides M and W together with linear orders on each of its sides, an *r-partite shifting* is a shifting s_{xy} where x and y belong to the same side. G is said to be *r-partitely shifted* if $s_{xy}(H) = H$ for all pairs $x < y$ that belong to the same side.

Given a collection $\mathcal{H} = (H_i,\ i \in I)$ of hypergraphs, we write $s_{xy}(\mathcal{H})$ for $(s_{xy}(H_i),\ i \in I)$.

As observed in [7] (see also [3]), shifting does not increase the matching number of a hypergraph. This can be generalized to rainbow matchings (see, e.g., [1, 12]):

Lemma 1.11. *Let $\mathcal{F} = (F_i \mid i \in I)$ be a collection of hypergraphs, sharing the same linearly ordered ground set V, and let $x < y$ be elements of V. If $s_{xy}(\mathcal{F})$ has a rainbow matching, then so does $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let $s_{xy}(e_i),\ i \in I$, be a rainbow matching for $s_{xy}(\mathcal{F})$. There is at most one i such that $x \in e_i$, say $e_i = a \cup \{x\}$ (where a is a set).

If there is no edge e_s containing y, then replacing e_i by $a \cup \{y\}$ as a representative of F_i, leaving all other e_s as they are, results in a rainbow matching for $\mathcal{F}$. If there is an edge e_s containing y, say $e_s = b \cup \{y\}$, then there exists an edge $b \cup \{x\} \in F_s$ (otherwise the edge e_s would have been shifted to $b \cup \{x\}$). Replacing then e_i by $a \cup \{y\}$ and e_s by $b \cup \{x\}$ results in a rainbow matching for $\mathcal{F}$. □

1.5. **The size of blocking hypergraphs.** For $\sigma \in \Psi_r$ we denote by $\overline{\sigma}$ the sequence obtained by replacing each $\wedge$ by a $\vee$ and vice versa. We also define $\overline{\alpha} = \omega$ and $\overline{\omega} = \alpha$. Clearly, $i(\sigma) > i(\tau)$ if and only if $i(\overline{\sigma}) < i(\overline{\tau})$, and hence we have:

$$i(\overline{\sigma}) = 2^r - i(\sigma) \tag{2}$$

By De Morgan's law, we have:

Lemma 1.12. $B(F_r(\sigma)) = F_r(\overline{\sigma})$.

Lemma 1.13. *If $i \leq j$ then $N(j+i) - N(j) \geq (n-1)N(i)$.*

Proof. By induction on $i + j$. Assume that the lemma is true for all i', j' whose sum is less than $i + j$, and let $s < j$. By the induction hypothesis:

$$N(s+i) \geq \max(N(i) + (n-1)N(s), N(s) + (n-1)N(i)) \geq N(i) + N(s) \tag{3}$$

Let $j = 2^p + s$, where $s < 2^p$. Assume first that $j + i \leq 2^{p+1}$, and write $j + i = 2^p + t$, where $t \leq 2^p$. By part 4 of Lemma 1.9 (the part saying that N-distances beyond 2^p are $(n-1)$-magnified N-distances below 2^p) we have $N(j+i) - N(j) = (n-1)(N(t) - N(s))$. By (3), $N(t) - N(s) \geq N(t-s) = N(i)$, and thus $N(j+i) - N(j) \geq (n-1)N(i)$.

Assume next that $j + i > 2^{p+1}$ and write $j + i = 2^{p+1} + w$. Then $i = 2^p + w - s$.

By the induction hypothesis we have $N(2^p + w) - N(s) \geq N(i)$. By Lemma 1.10 $N(2^{p+1}) - N(2^p + s) = (n-1)(N(2^p) - N(s))$ and $N(2^{p+1} + w) - N(2^{p+1}) = (n-1)(N(2^p + w) - N(2^p))$. Adding the last two equalities gives $N(j+i) - N(j) = (n-1)(N(2^p + w) - N(s))$, and since by (3) $N(2^p + w) - N(s) \geq N(i)$, we are done.

□

A converse inequality is also true, namely for every $k > 1$ it is true that:

$$N(k) = \max\{N(j) + (n-1)N(i) \mid j + i = k,\ i \leq j\} \tag{4}$$

Proof. Let p be maximal such that $2^p < k$, and let $k = 2^p + j$. By Lemma 1.6 (4) $N(k) = N(i) + (n-1)N(j)$. Combining this with Lemma 1.13 proves the desired equality. □

In [16] (4) was used as a defining recursion rule for the sequence $N(i)$ (which appeared there in a different context.)

For a number $t \leq n^r$ denote by $N^*(t)$ the number q such that $N(q-1) < t \leq N(q)$. This is an approximate inverse of N.

Theorem 1.14. *$b(t) = N(2^r - N^*(t))$ for every $t \leq n^r$.*

Proof. Let $F = F_r(\sigma(N^*(t))$. Then $|F| \geq t$, and since $B(F) = F_r(\bar{\sigma})$, we have $|B(F)| = N(2^r - N^*(t))$. This proves that $b(t) \geq N(2^r - N^*(t))$. To complete the proof we have to show that for every $F \subseteq [n]^r$ of size t we have $|B(F)| \leq N(2^r - N^*(t))$. Write $q = N^*(t)$. We wish to show that $|B(F)| \leq N(2^r - q)$. We do this

by induction on r. The case $r = 1$ is easy, so assume that we know the result for $r-1$ and we wish to prove it for r.

Let $F^+ = \{e \setminus V_r \mid v_r \in e \in F\}$ and $F^- = \{e \setminus V_r \mid e \in F,\ v_r \notin e\}$.

By Lemma 1.11 we may assume that F is r-partitely shifted, which in particular entails $F^- \subseteq F^+$. Let $B^+ = B_{r-1}(F^+)$ and $B^- = B_{r-1}(F^-)$, and let $f^+ = |F^+|,\ f^- = |F^-|,\ b^+ = |B^+|,\ b^- = |B^-|$. Then $b^- \le b^+$. Clearly:

$$B(F) = (B^- \times \{v_r\}) \cup (B^+ \times (V_r \setminus \{v_r\}))$$

and hence

$$|B(F)| = b^- + (n-1)b^+ \tag{5}$$

Let $i = N^*(f^-)$ and $j = N^*(f^+)$. Also let $i' = N^*(b^+),\ j' = N^*(b^-)$. By Lemma 1.13 we have:

$$|F| \le f^+ + (n-1)f^- \le N(i+j)$$

and hence $i + j \ge q$. By the inductive hypothesis $j' \le 2^{r-1} - i$, and $i' \le 2^{r-1} - j$, and hence $i' + j' \le 2^r - (i+j) \le 2^r - q$. By (5) and Lemma 1.13 , $|B(F)| \le N(i'+j') \le N(2^r - q)$, as desired.

□

Since $n^{r-1} = N(2^{r-1}) = 2^r - 2^{r-1}$, the case $k = 2$ of Conjecture 1.5(1) follows directly:

Corollary 1.15. *A pair F_1, F_2 of subsets of $[n]^r$ satisfying $|F_1| > n^{r-1}$ and $|F_2| \ge n^{r-1}$ has a rainbow matching.*

Here is a strengthening of this result:

Theorem 1.16. *If $F_1, F_2 \subseteq [n]^r$ and $|F_1||F_2| > n^{2(r-1)}$ then the pair (F_1, F_2) has a rainbow matching.*

The proof will follow from:

Lemma 1.17. *$N(a)N(b) \le N(ab)$.*

Proof. By induction on $a + b$. The case $a + b = 0$ is trivial. By (4) $N(a) = N(c) + (n-1)N(d)$ for some $c \le d < a$ such that $c + d = a$, and $N(b) = N(e) + (n-1)N(f)$ for some $e \le f < b$ such that $e + f = b$. Then

$$N(a)N(b) = N(c)N(e) + (n-1)[N(d)N(e) + N(c)N(f)] + (n-1)^2 N(d)N(f)$$

Using the induction hypothesis, we get:

$$N(a)N(b) \le N(ce) + (n-1)[N(d)N(e) + N(c)N(f)] + (n-1)^2 N(df)$$

Using Lemma 1.13 twice we get:

$$N(a)N(b) \le N(ce + cf) + (n-1)N(de + df) \le N(ce + cf + de + df) = N(ab).$$

□

The lemma implies that $N(2^{r-1} - q)N(2^{r-1} + q) \le N(2^{2(r-1)})$ for every $q \le 2^{r-1}$, meaning that $tb(t) \le n^{2(r-1)}$ for every $t \le n^{r-1}$, which is another way of formulating Theorem 1.16.

Remark 1.18. Theorem 1.16 was independently proved by Alon [2]. His proof uses spectral methods, as used also in [5, 11]. He also proved the following t-intersecting version:

Theorem 1.19. *For every t there exists $n = n_0(t)$ such that for every $n > n_0(t)$ and every pair $F_1, F_2 \subseteq [n]^r$, if $|F_1||F_2| > n^{2(r-t)}$ then there are $e_1 \in F_1$ and $e_2 \in F_2$ such that $|e_1 \cap e_2| < t$.*

2. Blockers in $\binom{[n]}{r}$

2.1. **Sequences of $\vee$'s and $\wedge$'s and the sets they define.** Let n be a positive integer. For a sequence $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m)$ of $\wedge$'s and $\vee$'s ($m < n$) let $T(\sigma)$ be the set of subsets e of $[n]$, satisfying

$$1 \in e\ \sigma_1\ (2 \in e\ \sigma_2\ (3 \in e \ldots \sigma_m\ (m+1 \in e)) \ldots)$$

For a number $r \leq n$ let $T_r(\sigma) = T(\sigma) \cap \binom{[n]}{r}$. Let also $t_r(\sigma) = |T_r(\sigma)|$ (this is the analogue of $f_r(\sigma)$ of the first section).

Example 2.1.

(1) If $\sigma = (\vee, \wedge, \vee, \wedge)$ then $T(\sigma) = \{e \in [n] \mid 1 \in e\ \vee\ (2 \in e\ \wedge\ (3 \in e\ \vee\ (4 \in e \wedge 5 \in e)))\}$.
(2) $T_r(\emptyset) = \{e \in \binom{[n]}{r} \mid 1 \in e\}$, and thus $t_r(\emptyset) = \binom{n-1}{r-1}$.
(3) If $\sigma = \wedge^{r-1}$ (meaning that $\sigma_i = \wedge$ for all $i < r$) then $T_r(\sigma) = \{ee \in \binom{[n]}{r} \mid \{1, 2, \ldots, r\} \subseteq e\} = \{[r]\}$, meaning that $t_r(\sigma) = 1$.

For a positive integer r, let Υ_r be the set of sequences $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_m)$ consisting of fewer than r symbols of $\wedge$ and fewer than r symbols of $\vee$. Let $\Theta_r = \Upsilon_r \cup \{\alpha\} \cup \{\omega\}$, where α and ω are two new elements. Define $T_r(\alpha) = \emptyset$ and $T_r(\omega) = \binom{[n]}{r}$.

Lemma 2.2. $|\Theta_r| = \binom{2r}{r} + 1$.

Proof. define a map from $\Upsilon_r \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ to the set of sequences of r symbols $\wedge$ and r symbols $\vee$, in which σ goes to a sequence $\psi(\sigma)$ obtained by appending to it at its end a sequence of the form $\wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge \vee \vee \ldots \vee$ or $\vee \vee \ldots \vee \wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge$, in which the first symbol is the opposite of the last symbol of σ. Clearly, σ is reconstructible from $\psi(\sigma)$, since the last symbol of σ is recognizable - it is the first symbol, going from right to left, in the third stretch of identical symbols in $\psi(\sigma)$. The two sequences $\vee \vee \ldots \vee \wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge$ and $\wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge \vee \vee \ldots \vee$ are missing from the image, and remembering that $\emptyset \in \Upsilon_r$ this proves that $|\Upsilon_r| = \binom{2r}{r} - 1$. □

We now wish to order Θ_r. For this purpose we extend every sequence in Υ_r by appending a symbol $*$ at its end, and then ordering Υ_r lexicographically, with the convention $\wedge < * < \vee$ (the "*" is then discarded). We also define α to be the minimal element and ω to be the largest element of Θ_r.

2.2. **The sequence $M_r(i)$.** Write $m = \binom{2r}{r}$. Let $\sigma_0 = \alpha < \sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \ldots < \omega = \sigma_m$ be the order defined above on Θ_r, and let $M(i) = M_r(i) = t_r(\sigma_i)$.

Observation 2.3. *The sequence $M(i)$ is strictly ascending.*

Here is for example the sequence for $r = 3$ and general n:

$0, 1, 2, 3, n-2, n-1, n, 2n-5, 2n-4, 3n-9, \binom{n-1}{2}, \binom{n-1}{2}+1, \binom{n-1}{2}+2, \binom{n-1}{2}+n-3, \binom{n-1}{2}+n-2, \binom{n-1}{2}+2n-7, \binom{n-1}{2}+\binom{n-2}{2}, \binom{n-1}{2}+\binom{n-2}{2}+1, \binom{n-1}{2}+\binom{n-2}{2}+n-4, \binom{n-1}{2}+\binom{n-2}{2}+\binom{n-3}{2}, \binom{n}{3}$.

This sequence does not seem to behave as nicely as the sequence $N(i)$ from the first section, but like the sequence $N(i)$ it has landmarks.

Theorem 2.4.

(1) $\sigma(\binom{2r-i}{r}) = \wedge^{i-1}$.
(2) $\sigma(\binom{2r}{r} - \binom{2r-i}{r-i}) = \vee^{i-1}$.
(3) $M(\binom{2r-i}{r}) = \binom{n-i}{r-i}$.
(4) $M(\binom{2r}{r} - \binom{2r-i}{r-i}) = \binom{n-1}{r-1} + \binom{n-2}{r-1} + \ldots + \binom{n-i}{r-1}$.

Proof. Part (1): the sequences preceding $\wedge^{i-1}$ are those that start with $\wedge^i$. Using the same idea as in the proof of Lemma 2.2, we define a map between the set of the sequences σ preceding $\wedge^{i-1}$ and the set of sequences of r symbols of $\vee$ and $r-i$ symbols of $\wedge$: we complete σ to a sequence of r symbols $\vee$ and r symbols $\wedge$ by appending to σ at its end a sequence $\vee \vee \ldots \vee \wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge$ or $\wedge \wedge \ldots \wedge \vee \vee \ldots \vee$, where the first symbol of the appended sequence is the opposite of the last symbol of σ. The only sequence that is not in the image of this map is $\wedge^r \vee^r$, and hence the number of sequences preceding $\wedge^{i-1}$ is $\binom{2r-i}{r}$-1.

Part (2) follows by symmetry. Parts (3) and (4) follow by simple counting. □

2.3. **Calculating $b(t)$ for $t \leq \binom{n}{r}$.** For $\sigma \in \Upsilon_r$ denote by $\overline{\sigma}$ the sequence obtained from σ by replacing each $\wedge$ by a $\vee$ and vice versa. Also define $\overline{\alpha} = \omega$ and $\overline{\omega} = \alpha$. By De Morgan's law, we have:

Lemma 2.5. *$B(T_r(\sigma)) = T_r(\overline{\sigma})$.*

The main result of this section is:

Theorem 2.6. *For every number $0 \leq t \leq \binom{n}{r}$ there exists $0 \leq i \leq \binom{2r}{r}$ such that $b(t) = M(i)$.*

The proof uses an already mentioned idea of Daykin [4], who gave a proof of the EKR theorem using the Kruskal-Katona theorem.

For a hypergraph F and a number r, the *r-shadow* of F, denoted by $S_r(F)$, is $\bigcup_{f \in F} \binom{f}{r}$. A hypergraph F of uniformity k is said to be in "cascade form" if there exist sets $B_0 = [n] \supseteq B_1 \supsetneqq \ldots \supsetneqq B_{s+1}$ and elements $x_i \in B_{i-1} \setminus B_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq s)$, such that

$$F = \binom{B_1}{k} \cup x_1 * \binom{B_2}{k-1} \cup x_1 * x_2 * \binom{B_3}{k-2} \cup \ldots \cup x_1 * x_2 * \ldots * x_s * \binom{B_{s+1}}{k-s}$$

Here "*" stands for the join operation, meaning that $x * H = \{h \cup \{x\} \mid h \in H\}$.

Theorem 2.7. [14, 15] *Given numbers m, n and $r \leq k$, the minimum of $|S_r(H)|$ over all $H \subseteq \binom{H}{k}$ is attained at a hypergraph H having cascade form.*

Proof of Theorem 2.6 We have to show that there exists $\beta \in \Upsilon_r$ satisfying the following condition: the maximum of $|B(H)|$ over all hypergraphs $H \subseteq \binom{n}{r}$ of cardinality t is attained at a hypergraph H for which $B(H) = T_r(\beta)$ for some sequence $\beta \in \Upsilon_r$.

Clearly, $B(H) = S_r(\bar{H})^c$, where $\bar{H}$ is the set of complements of edges in H, and $S_r(\bar{H})^c$ denotes the set of all edges of size r that do not belong to $S_r(\bar{H})$. By Theorem 2.7 the maximal value of $|B(H)|$ over all $H \subseteq \binom{n}{r}$ is attained at a hypergraph H for which $\bar{H}$ has cascade form. Let this form be

$$\bar{H} = \binom{B_1}{n-r} \cup x_1 * \binom{B_2}{n-r-1} \cup x_1 * x_2 * \binom{B_3}{n-r-2} \cup \ldots \cup x_1 * x_2 * \ldots * x_s * \binom{B_{s+1}}{n-r-s} \tag{6}$$

Here possibly $s = 0$. As above, we define $B_0 = [n]$. For each $0 \leq i \leq s$ let $B_i \setminus (B_{i+1} \cup \{x_i\}) = \{z_1^i, \ldots, z_{t_i}^i\}$, where $t_i = |B_i \setminus B_{i+1}| - 1$ (Here possibly $t_i = 0$).

Assertion 2.8. *$B(H) = T(\theta)$, where*

$$\theta = z_1^0 \vee (z_2^0 \ldots \vee (z_{t_0}^0 \vee (x_1 \wedge (z_1^1 \vee (z_2^1 \vee \ldots \vee (z_{t_1}^1 \vee (x_2 \wedge (z_1^2 \vee (z_2^2 \vee \ldots \vee (z_{t_2}^2 \ldots$$

if $B_1 \neq [n]$ and $\theta = \alpha$ if $B_1 = [n]$.

To prove the assertion, we have to show that a set e of size r belongs to $S_r(\bar{H})^c$ if and only if it satisfies the conditions imposed by θ. If e contains one of $z_1^0, z_2^0 \ldots, z_{t_0}^0$ then it does not belong to $S_r(\bar{H})$ because edges in $\bar{H}$ are contained in $\{x_1\} \cup B_0$. If e does not contain any of these vertices, it may still belong to $S_r(\bar{H})^c$, if it contains x_1. In such a case if e also contains none of $z_1^1, z_2^1 \ldots, z_{t_1}^1, x_2$ then it belongs to $S_r(\bar{H})$. So, we may assume that e contains one of these vertices or it contains x_2 together with x_1, and so on. This completes the proof of the assertion.

Next note that since e is of size r, it suffices to stop just after x_r, and obtain a condition that is satisfied by e if and only if $e \in T(\theta)$. For example, for $r = 2$ a set of size 2 satisfies the condition

$$x_1 \wedge (z_1^1 \vee (x_2 \wedge (z_1^2 \vee x_3)))$$

if and only if it satisfies the condition

$$x_1 \wedge (z_1^1 \vee x_2)$$

Let β be the formula obtained by truncating θ after x_r, if indeed x_r appears, and let $\beta = \theta$ otherwise.

Note also that the number of $\vee$'s in θ is equal to the number of z_i^j's in θ. The assumption is that the set $\binom{B_{s+1}}{n-r-s}$ appearing in (6) is non-empty, which implies that $|B_{s+1}| \geq n-r-s$. This is easily seen to imply that the number of z_i^j's is at most r. Thus $\beta \in \Upsilon_r$, which completes the proof of Theorem 2.6.

We can now achieve our aim - the calculation of $b(t)$ for every $t \leq \binom{n}{r}$.

Theorem 2.9. *If $M(i-1) < t \leq M(i)$ then $b(t) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - i)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.5 $b(M(j)) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - j)$ for all $0 \leq j \leq \binom{2r}{r}$. Since $b(c) \leq b(d)$ whenever $c \geq d$, this implies that $M(\binom{2r}{r} - i) \leq b(t) \leq M(\binom{2r}{r} - i + 1)$, and by Theorem 2.6 it follows that either $b(t) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - i + 1)$ or $b(t) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - i)$. By the definition of the function b we have $b(b(t)) \geq t$, and hence if $b(t) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - i + 1)$ then $t \leq b(M(\binom{2r}{r} - i + 1) = M(i-1)$, contradicting the assumption of the theorem. Thus $b(t) = M(\binom{2r}{r} - i)$. □

References

[1] R. Aharoni and D. Howard, An Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem for rainbow matchings, *submitted for publication*

[2] N. Alon, Private communication.

[3] J. Akiyama and P. Frankl, On the Size of Graphs with Complete-Factors, *J. Graph Theory***9**(1),(1985) 197–201.

[4] D. E Daykin, Erdős-Ko-Rado from Kruskal-Katona, *J. Combin. Th. Ser. A*, **17** (1974), 254–255.

[5] D. Ellis, E. Friedgut and H. Pilpel, Intersecting families of permutations. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **24** (2011), 649-682.

[6] P. Erdős, A problem of independent r-tuples, *Ann. Univ. Budapest* **8** (1964), 93–95.

[7] P. Erdős and T. Gallai, On the minimal number of vertices representing the edges of a graph, *Publ . Math. Inst. Hungar . Acad. Sci.* 6(1961), 18, 1-203.

[8] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math Oxford* Ser. (2) 12(1961), 313-320.

[9] P. Frankl, The shifting technique in extremal set theory, in *Surveys in combinatorics*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 123, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (1987), 81-110.

[10] P. Frankl, V. Rödl, and A. Rucinski, On the maximum number of edges in a triple system not containing a disjoint family of a given size, *to appear*

[11] E. Friedgut, On the measure of intersecting families, uniqueness and stability, *Combinatorica* **28**(2008), 503-528.

[12] D. Howard and A. Yehudayoff, Rainbow Erdős-Ko-Rado, *in preparation.*

[13] H. Huang, P. Loh and B. Sudakov, The size of a hypergraph and its matching number, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **21** (2012), 442-450.

[14] J. B. Kruskal, The number of simplices in a complex, in *Mathematical Optimization Techniques*, R. Bellman ed., University of California Press (1963).

[15] A theorem of finite sets, *Theory of Graphs,* P. Erdős and G. O. H. Katona, eds., Akadḿiai Kiad́o and Academic Press (1968).

[16] D. E. Knuth, A recurrence involving maxima, *American Mathematical Monthly* **114** (2007), 835; solution in **116** (2009), 649.

[17] M. Matsumoto, N. Tokushige, The exact bound in the Erdos-Ko-Rado theorem for cross-intersecting families, *J. Combin. Theory* Ser. A 52 (1989) 90–97.

[18] R. Meshulam, *Private communication.*

[19] L. Pyber, A new generalization of the Erdos-Ko-Rado theorem, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **43** (1986), 85–90.

[20] N. Tokushige, On cross t-intersecting families of sets, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **117** (2010), 1167–1177.

[21] N. Tokushige, Cross t intersecting integer sequences from weighted Erdős-Ko-Rado, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **22** (July 2013), 622–637.

Department of Mathematics, Technion

E-mail address, Ron Aharoni: raharoni@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, Colgate University

E-mail address, David Howard: dmhoward@colgate.edu